

REMARKS

Claims 18-27, 50-59, 69, 70, 76, 77, and 79-81 are pending in the Application. Applicants have amended Claims 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 50, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58, 69, 70, 76, and 77 and added new claims 79-91. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Interview Summary

Applicants express appreciation for the telephonic interview held on March 28, 2006, between the Examiner and Applicants' undersigned agent, whereupon Applicants asserted that the finality of the rejection was premature, whereupon the Examiner indicated that he has discussed the matter with his SPE, and whereupon the Patent Office indicated that it has withdrawn the finality of the rejection. In reliance of this representation, Applicants now reply under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, rather than any one or more of §§ 1.113, 1.114, and 1.116.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejects Claims 18, 23, 50, 55, 69, 70, 76, and 77 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, due to the recited feature of "complete physical address." Although they disagree with the rejection, the Applicants have deleted "complete physical address" from the claims, rendering the rejection moot. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

By reciting “standardized physical address” features in the amended claims, Applicants do not add new subject matter. See, e.g., page 14, line 21, through page 15, line 8; and page 23, line 14, through page 24, line 6 of the as-filed Application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejects Claims 18-20, 22-25, 27, 50-52, 54-57, 59, 69-70, and 76-77 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,285,777 to Kanevsky et al. (Kanevsky). Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reason that Kanevsky fails to teach or suggest all recited features of the claims.

Regarding Independent Claims 18, 50, 69, and 76, Kanevsky does not teach or suggest receiving a message including “a non-standardized physical address” and “determining a standardized physical address” “wherein the non-standardized physical address includes a 5-digit ZIP Code and the standardized physical address includes a 7-digit ZIP Code” as recited in Claim 18. Nor does Kanevsky teach or suggest the similar features recited in Claims 50, 69, and 76. Claims 18, 50, 69, and 76 are allowable for at least this reason.

With further regard to Independent Claims 18, 50, 69, and 76, Kanevsky does not teach or suggest “an electronic address associated with the user’s electronic account and a non-standardized physical address of the user” as recited in Claim 18. Kanevsky does not disclose the use of an electronic account at all. And Kanevsky only discloses an association between a sender’s

electronic address and a recipient's electronic address. Kanevsky column 6, lines 1-3. Nor does Kanevsky teach or suggest similar features recited in independent Claims 50, 69, and 76. Accordingly, Claims 18, 50, 69, and 76 are allowable for at least this additional reason.

Claims 19-22 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable Claim 18. Claims 51-54 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable Claim 50.

Regarding Independent Claims 23, 55, 70, and 77, Kanevsky does not teach or suggest receiving a message including "a non-standardized electronic address" and "determining a standardized electronic address" "wherein the standardized electronic address is an alias with respect to the non-standardized electronic address" as recited in Claim 23. At best, Kanevsky discloses error correction of an e-mail address. Kanevsky col. 5, line 62 through col. 6, line 1. It is axiomatic that an incorrect e-mail address is not an alias with respect to a correct e-mail address. Nor does Kanevsky teach or suggest similar features recited in Claims 55, 70, and 77. Claims 23, 55, 70, and 77 are allowable for at least this reason.

Claims 24-27 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable Claim 23. Claims 56-59 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable Claim 55.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejects Claims 21, 26, 53, and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kanevsky in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,341,505 to Whitehouse (Whitehouse). Applicants traverse the rejection because Kanevsky and Whitehouse, either separately or combined, fail to disclose all features recited in the claims and because it is improper to combine the references.

In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Whitehouse does not teach or suggest the feature of “an electronic address associated with the user’s electronic account and a non-standardized physical address” recited in Claims 18 and 50. Neither Kanevsky nor Whitehouse discloses an electronic account, or the aforementioned association feature. Claims 18 and 50 are allowable for at least this reason. Claim 21 is allowable for at least the reason that it depends from allowable Claim 18, and Claim 53 is allowable for at least the reason that it depends from allowable Claim 50.

In addition, Whitehouse does not disclose the feature of “the standardized electronic address is an alias with respect to the non-standardized electronic address” that is recited in Claims 23 and 55, and absent in Kanevsky. Claims 23 and 55 are allowable for at least this reason. Claim 26 is allowable for at least the reason that it depends from allowable Claim 23, and Claim 58 is allowable for at least the reason that it depends from allowable Claim 55.

Applicants also traverse the Section 103 rejections because the Office Action fails to demonstrate a suggestion or motivation to combine Kanevsky and

Whitehouse in a manner that results in the claimed invention. Such combination could only have been made using impermissible hindsight reasoning.

New Claims

Applicants have added new Claims 79-91 and believe they are in condition for allowance. Applicants have not added new subject matter, since features recited in new claims 79-91 are discussed at least with reference to Figures 3, 4, 9, and 10 in the as-filed Application.


Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that an interview would advance prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (571) 203-2700.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Dated: March 29, 2006

By: _____


Steven R. Olsen
Reg. No. 48,174

cc: William J. Brogan, Esquire